

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed July 10, 2008 the Office noted that claims 1-14 were pending and rejected claims 1-14. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-14 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Breslow, U.S. Patent No. 2007/0058656. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to further "[a] method for *configuring a processing system that comprises program code, the program code comprising a plurality of instructions for processing data packets in a communications network, the method comprising: dividing the program code into a plurality of sequences, each sequence performing a certain task on a data packet passing through the communications network, providing a processor instruction memory comprising rows and columns; allocating each sequence to a column of the processor instruction memory; defining, based on the program code, a plurality of relocation objects, each corresponding to a dependency relationship between two or more of*

the sequences, and by means of the relocation object providing information that there is an alternative sequence to jump to at the instruction at which the relocation object is located." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 1, rows 5 and column 6; and Fig. 5 and its supporting text of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the amendment of claim 1.

The prior art of record fails to disclose "providing a processor instruction memory comprising rows and columns," and "by means of the relocation object providing information that there is an alternative sequence to jump to at the instruction at which the relocation object is located." It is also submitted that such a feature is not obvious as instruction memory is normally a linear address space.

The Applicants have amended claim 8 in a manner consistent with the amendment to claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 and 7 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Breslow.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breslow in view of Wagner, U.S. Patent No. 2003/0023388. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Wagner adds nothing to the deficiencies of Breslow as applied to the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Breslow and Wagner, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-14 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg. No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb